

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Tuesday, August 6, 2013

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Mission Hills, Kansas met on August 6, 2013, at 3:00 PM at Mission Hills City Hall, 6300 State Line Road, Mission Hills, Kansas for the purpose of reviewing building permit applications.

PRESIDING: Dorsey Troutman, Vice Chair

PRESENT: Cia Mackle, Craig Alexander, Ted Knapp

ABSENT: Nancy Ruzicka

ALSO PRESENT: Courtney Christensen, City Administrator; Todd Ault, City Architect; Neil Shortlidge, City Attorney; Mark Baltzell, Intern; Roy Farchmin, Council Liaison.

VISITORS: Mike Sinatra, 2508 64th Street; John Gyllenborg, 11409 Brookwood, Leawood (Claiborn); Marie Woodbury, 3201 68th Street; Karen Austin, 6716 Willow Lane; Lucy Mayor 5510 Oak St (Copaken); Bob Schulte (Copaken); Matthew Hufft (Copaken); Dan Brown (Copaken); Manuel Pardo, 6507 Seneca Road (Konecny); John Wind, 2121 Central #143, Kansas City (Konecny); Lindsay Tarto, 2121 Central #143, Kansas City (Konecny); Ann Konecny, 6509 Belinder; Paul Konecny, 6509 Belinder; Jennifer Goeke, 6530 Oakwood (Konecny); Don Sheilds, 2909 Tomahawk Road; Sarah Kempf (Druten); Skip Hensler (Druten); Octave Merveille, 6500 Aberdeen (Druten); Elynne Merveille 6500 Aberdeen (Druten); Suzanne Allen, 6511 Seneca Road (Druten); Robert Barnes, 6445 Seneca Road (Druten); Ed Curry, 6424 Aberdeen Road (Druten).

At 3:00 PM Mr. Troutman called to order the August 6, 2013 ARB meeting. Mr. Troutman asked the Board if there are any necessary revisions to the July 19th or July 23rd minutes. Mr. Knapp moved to approve the July 19th minutes; Ms. Mackle seconded. Passed 3-0. Ms. Mackle moved to approve the July 23rd minutes; Mr. Knapp seconded. Passed 3-0.

Mr. Ault stated that Mr. Edge is not present for the meeting and that he will present Mr. Edge's project at the end of the meeting.

#1 Michael & Katherine Sinatra
2508 W 64th Street

Door and multiple window replacements

Mr. Ault stated that at the front of the house, a small window adjacent to the front door will be replaced with a new unit to match the existing window. He continued that at the small breezeway that connects the main mass of the house to the left wing, a new door will be added at the front of the opening in lieu of being recessed back into the house and that the proposed door will be raised

panel to match the existing woodwork on the house. Mr. Ault added that at the rear of the house an existing pair of casement windows will be replaced with two pairs of windows.

Ms. Sinatra stated that her neighbors are in favor of the changes. Mr. Sinatra added that he has brought letters of support from his neighbors on each side of his house and a letter from his neighbor across the street. Mr. Troutman stated that he saw no issues with the proposed project and asked the Board if they had any concerns. Ms. Mackle stated that she had no concerns with the project.

Ms. Mackle moved to approve the project as submitted; Mr. Knapp seconded. Passed 3-0.

#2 Marie Woodbury & Daniel Claiborn
3201 W 68th Street

New eyebrow roof at rear of existing home

Mr. Ault stated that the Claiborns are proposing a new eyebrow roof at the rear of their home which will connect the two wing gable roofs. Mr. Ault added that the proposed roof will project 3 feet from the house and that there are no issues with City ordinances or Guidelines.

Mr. Gyllenborg stated that the intent of the project is to provide sun-shading for the rear patio. Ms. Mackle asked if the proposed roof will be the same depth as the eyebrow roof on the right gable. Mr. Gyllenborg stated that Ms. Mackle is correct. Mr. Gyllenborg added that the soffit under the proposed roof will match the soffit under the overhang on the right gable.

Mr. Knapp moved to accept the project as submitted; Ms. Mackle seconded. Passed 3-0.

#3 Karen Austin
6716 Willow Lane

Four new dormers

Mr. Alexander entered the meeting at 3:07 PM.

Mr. Ault stated that Ms. Austin is proposing four new dormers on her home; three on the right side and one on the left. Mr. Ault stated that the proposed dormers are similar to existing dormers at the rear of the house. Mr. Ault stated that the three proposed dormers on the north elevation will be identical to the existing dormers on the rear of the house, while the proposed dormer on the south elevation will be slightly larger. Mr. Ault added that on the north side the dormers will not line up with the existing first floor windows; however, the existing windows are irregularly positioned and it would not be reasonable to require the dormers to line up with the windows.

Mr. Troutman asked if the materials will be used for the new dormers will match the existing dormers. Ms. Austin stated that the new dormers will match the dormers on the rear of the house in terms of design and materials. Mr. Knapp asked if the new windows will be true divided light. Ms. Austin replied that the windows will be simulated divided light. Ms. Christensen asked if the simulated divided light windows will have muntins on the inside, outside and between panes. Ms. Austin replied this is correct. Ms. Mackle asked how the ridge height of the proposed dormers will compare to the existing dormers. Ms. Austin stated that the ridge height of the new dormers will be the same as the existing dormers. Ms. Austin added that she will be replacing the windows on the existing dormers on the front and rear of the home and that these windows will match the proposed windows for the new dormers.

Mr. Knapp moved to accept the project as submitted; Ms. Mackle seconded. Passed 4-0.

#4 Jamie & Ellen Copaken
6205 Ensley Lane

Multiple exterior renovations

Mr. Ault stated that the Copakens are proposing to modify the existing addition to their home. Mr. Ault stated that on the front elevation the small portion of the existing addition which is visible will be modified to add stucco and siding to match the materials on the rest of the home. Mr. Ault stated that matching stucco will also be added to the west façade.

Mr. Ault continued that at the right end of the rear elevation, a new addition cantilevers into the rear yard and features a contemporary floor to ceiling storefront glass system. Mr. Ault added that the Copakens are proposing to replace the existing flat roof on the rear of the house with a low slope roof with shingles to match the rest of the house. Mr. Ault stated that there are no ordinance concerns with this project. Mr. Ault noted that the Design Guidelines recommend a 1.3 to 1 house-to-house green-space ratio and that the exact dimensions were not provided; however, the requirement of 35.75 feet between homes appears to have been met. Mr. Ault added that the proposed clear-view windows in the back are not in keeping with the style of the home and as such are an additional Design Guideline concern.

Mr. Hufft stated that the house is a Tudor style home, originally built in 1937. He continued that the photos of the home show that the view from the street of the existing addition is blocked by multiple trees. Mr. Hufft stated that the addition built in 1980 on the east side of the home is where the majority of the change will occur. Mr. Hufft added that there is limited visibility from the east lot line due to the number of trees on the lot. Mr. Hufft noted that the neighbor's house has large modern windows and that the proposed changes to the Copaken's home would relate to the neighborhood.

Mr. Hufft stated that the home has evolved since its construction in 1937 and added that the evolution of the home began in 1980 when the large living room was added. Mr. Hufft stated that the Copaken's are updating the addition by including another gable which will cantilever 4 feet out to the east. Mr. Knapp stated that the plans indicate the removal of a chimney. Mr. Hufft stated that the chimney will be removed in order to open up interior space within the home. Mr. Hufft stated that the remodel of the addition will include a new kitchen and breakfast nook. In addition, the living room will be remodeled as the Copakens would like a more modern design with an open view of the back yard. He noted that the new windows will have no muntins. Mr. Hufft continued that the upstairs remodel will include a new master suite and study which is where the cantilevered gable projects to the rear. Mr. Hufft added that the owners would like as much glass as possible and that from the street the house has a consistent Tudor design, while the rear will contain more modern elements.

Mr. Troutman asked for the pitch of the new gable. Mr. Hufft stated that the rear gable will have a 13.5 / 12 pitch. Mr. Huppt stated that on the west elevation the proposed second story divided light windows will match the existing windows on the home. Stucco will be added to the first floor and new clear view windows will replace the existing windows of the same size. Mr. Hufft stated that on the rear elevation a clear span of glass covers the façade of the gable and that on the first floor four sets of clear-view sliding doors will be included, each set measuring 12 feet wide. Mr. Troutman asked if any of the existing first floor rear windows will remain. Mr. Hufft stated that they will all be replaced. Mr. Brown noted that there are existing clear-view windows on the house.

Mr. Knapp stated that he has no issues with the form of the design and the way the gabled roof works with the rest of the home. He added that his concern is with the large clear-view windows on the cantilevered gable. Mr. Brown noted that the rear yard is heavily wooded and that the owners would prefer a lot of natural light. Mr. Hufft stated the existing addition has a lot of glass and which is one of the reasons the Copakens like the home and was one of the factors which drove the design. Ms. Mackle stated that the plans are well thought out; however, she is concerned that the changes will not match the existing style of the home and as such will not fit with the Design Guidelines. She added that a lesser concern is the way the addition cantilevers out to the rear. Mr. Hufft responded that the addition currently has large open windows and cantilevers to the rear. Mr. Troutman stated that he likes the proposed change to the roof line of the addition but that he is concerned with the large amount of clear windows. Mr. Troutman added that he is not as concerned with the cantilever design.

Mr. Brown stated that he performed a study on the historic Tudor homes in the area and tried to work that into the form of the design. Ms. Mackle agreed that this is an incredibly thoughtful proposal. Mr. Alexander asked if the owners would be willing to change the window style on the rear and west elevations to a style that is more in keeping with the Tudor style. Mr. Hufft stated that the owners would prefer the large clear windows and while they know this will not conform to the Design Guidelines, they wanted to veer from those restrictions. Mr. Hufft stated that if this design is not approved he would discuss alternative options with the owners. Mr. Brown asked for some guidance concerning the style of windows that would be more acceptable. Ms. Mackle stated that the size of the windows is not a concern for her; however, she would be more inclined to approve divided light windows. Mr. Troutman stated that with more appropriate windows he would be more inclined to approve the project as the form of the addition follows the traditional Tudor revival design. However, with the currently proposed windows he would not be comfortable with the modern elements on the Tudor home. Mr. Brown asked if the Board would be more comfortable approving the project if the first floor clear-view windows and the wall of glass on the gable were changed to divided light windows. Mr. Knapp stated that he would be more comfortable with divided light. Ms. Mackle stated that she would like to see dividers on the sliding doors as well.

Mr. Knapp moved to continue the project to the August 20, 2013 ARB meeting; Ms. Mackle seconded. Passed 4-0.

#5 Paul & Ann Konecny
6509 Belinder Avenue

New swimming pool, pool house and
pool cabana in rear yard

Mr. Ault stated that the Konecnys are proposing a new swimming pool, pool house and pool cabana in their rear yard. He noted that this is a substantial construction matter and was noticed to the neighbors on July 3, 2013. Mr. Ault stated that the proposed 2-story pool house is a rear wing addition located directly behind the main house with roofing and windows to match the existing home. He stated that it will be connected to the main house with a short covered walkway and will be all brick. Mr. Ault continued that the proposed pool will be located behind the main house and will be surrounded by a large stone pool deck. Due to the slope of the property, a stone retaining wall has been added behind the porch and the pool equipment is located in the rear yard behind the retaining wall. Mr. Ault stated that the proposed pool cabana will sit at the end of the pool opposite the pool house. He noted that it will be a smaller, all-stone structure with an interior fireplace and will feature a standing seam copper roof. Mr. Ault added that there is one issue with the Design Guidelines. He noted that the addition sits on the 20% setback line and measures 29 feet tall; while the Guidelines recommend it should be no taller than 24 feet on the setback. Mr. Ault stated that the roof of the addition does step back and is not 29 feet tall at the 20% line.

Mr. Wind stated that the home was built 8 years ago and that the owners would like to add a 20' x 40' pool, a pool house, a cabana and want to make the addition look like part of the original home. Mr. Wind stated that a retaining wall will be constructed on the east side of the pool deck and that the top of the wall will sit 18 inches above the deck. Mr. Wind continued that the existing driveway will extend slightly to the rear and at the end of the driveway the existing iron gate will move back and a new gate will be installed leading to the addition. Mr. Wind noted that the proposed addition will be connected via the second floor and is roofed over on the first floor. Mr. Wind stated that the new elements on the north elevation include the walk- through connection to the addition, the pool house and the side view of the chimney. Mr. Wind stated that on the south elevation the connection is to the left of the addition. He added that the first floor of the addition has three sets of sliding doors on the south elevation for access to the deck. Mr. Wind stated that at the front of the house the owners would like to add a small brick patio space 18 inches higher than grade to access two sets of French doors. Mr. Ault stated that there may be a variance involved with the front patio and that the south end of the pool deck needs to be pulled out of the side yard setback.

Ms. Christensen asked if the increase of impervious surface has been taken into account and if a water drainage study has been performed. Ms. Christensen added that the neighbors to the south and east have had water issues since this house was built. Mr. Wind replied that a water drainage study has been performed by Don Baker. Mr. Wind stated that Mr. Baker made recommendations for underground retention.

Ms. Mackle asked if there are other materials other than the brick to match the existing materials on main the house. Mr. Wind replied that the dormers will have stucco and finished wood. Mr. Wind also pointed out the iron railing on the pool house second story deck. Mr. Knapp stated that the only issue with the Design Guidelines is the height of the addition at the setback. Mr. Wind stated that the highest point of the roof is several feet back from the setback. Mr. Wind stated that if he were to attempt to flatten the roof, the highest point would be about 26'. Discussion ensued concerning the roof line. Ms. Mackle stated that she would prefer to keep the 29 foot height if it matches the height of the existing roofs. Mr. Troutman agreed that in this case consistency is more important and noted that the highest point of the addition is several feet back from the setback. Mr. Wind added that the Design Guidelines were referring to a gabled end at the setback; however, the hip roof on the addition does not exceed 24 feet in height outside of the acceptable zone.

Ms. Goeke stated that she is the Konecny's neighbor to the east. She continued that during the construction of the original drainage system for the home a pipe was installed on the wrong side of the property. She noted that since the original installation the water runoff situation has improved; however, anything to further improve water runoff into her yard would be greatly appreciated. Mr. Wind stated that there may be a fairly simple solution and added that he will discuss this with the water drainage engineer for the project.

Mr. Troutman stated that he would like to go through the substantial construction checklist. Mr. Troutman noted that a 5 foot adjustment needs to be made to the south end of the pool deck in order to bring it out of the side yard setback. Mr. Troutman noted that a variance may be required for the front patio. Mr. Ault noted that a first floor plan will need to be reviewed in order to determine if a variance is required. Mr. Troutman stated that the design of the addition is in keeping with the existing house and that the project conforms to the Design Guidelines. The Board Agreed. Mr. Troutman asked if any trees will be removed from the property. Mr. Wind replied that one tree will be removed in the location of the pool house. Mr. Ault stated that due to the proposed pool, the fence on the property will need to comply with Appendix G of the International Building Code.

Mr. Shortlidge read the required findings for ARB approval of a building permit

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 1: That the structure to be erected or altered does, or will, meet the customary architectural requirements in appearance and design for a structure of the type proposed, and that the proposed structure is, or will be, in general conformity with the style and design of the surrounding structures. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 2: That the proposed structure will not adversely affect the values of surrounding properties and will not adversely affect the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents of the City. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 3: That the proposed structure conforms to the Design Guidelines adopted by Resolution No. 2012-G, or, if it does not conform to the Design Guidelines, that the applicant has provided sufficient justification for the deviation from the Design Guidelines. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 4: That the proposed structure conforms to the principles of the Comprehensive Plan. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Alexander moved to approve the project as proposed with the conditions that the south end of the pool deck is moved outside of the side yard setback and that the front porch does not require a variance; Ms. Mackle seconded. Passed 4-0.

#6 **Bob & Jane Druten**
6503 Seneca Road

New home

Mr. Ault stated that the Drutens are proposing a new 6,808 square foot home with a 4,337 square foot footprint. Mr. Ault continued that the proposed home is primarily brick with cedar shake accents and wood trim. He noted that the proposed home is 1 ½ story with a high plate line at 12 feet. Mr. Ault stated that the house fenestration features mostly true divided light casement windows and that certain windows at the front and rear of the house have significantly different muntin patterns. Mr. Ault noted that the home features a prominent front door which protrudes slightly from the main mass of the home and does not include a porch.

Mr. Ault stated that the Design Guidelines suggests that the central mass of a home should be between 40 and 80 feet and the depth of the main mass should be 25 to 40 feet deep. Mr. Ault noted that the main mass of the proposed home is 52 feet wide and 40 feet deep and that while the depth of the home is more than half the width, overall this criteria has been met. Mr. Ault continued that the Design Guidelines suggest that walkways should be between 3 to 5 feet wide but no dimensions were given for the front walkway. Mr. Ault stated that the proposed home is approximately 52 feet from the rear property line which is about 29% of the lot depth. The Design Guidelines suggest that the height of the home at the rear should be 24 feet tall and the proposed home is 25 feet tall in the rear. Mr. Ault added that while this Guideline has not been specifically met, the house sits downhill from its rear neighbors. Mr. Ault stated that the 12 foot plate lines of the proposed home are considerably higher than the adjacent homes and that the ARB had noted this as a concern during the conceptual review of the project. Mr. Ault added that this has not changed since the conceptual review.

Mr. Wind stated that the proposed house is centered on the property with a side entry garage to limit the view of the garage doors from the street. Mr. Wind stated that the front yard will be re-graded in

order to limit the slope of the driveway to 10%. Mr. Wind added that the driveway walls will be lowered to less than 3 feet from 5 feet. Mr. Wind noted that a few unhealthy trees will be removed from the property and that a drainage study from Don Baker shows a decrease in impervious surface from the existing home so there will be no new water retention requirements.

Mr. Wind stated that the design of the home follows a picturesque Tudor style brick home with cedar shingle siding. He added that the brick will have a rustic handmade appearance. The roof will be a grand slate roof. Mr. Wind stated that the home will include a main mass with two wings that project forward. He added that the front walk will meander at a width of less than 5 feet. Mr. Wind stated that there will be a large bay window on the front elevation which looks out from the great room. Mr. Troutman asked if this had been changed from the original. Mr. Wind stated that this configuration is slightly different from the original design. Mr. Wind stated that the home will have Southside Steel windows and a cedar and steel pergola in the rear yard with an outdoor fire pit behind a brick wall. Mr. Wind stated that there will be a screened-in porch at the rear of the house. Mr. Wind noted that the rear neighbor will see the two wing gables on each side of the main mass. Mr. Troutman asked if there are any questions from the ARB. Mr. Alexander asked for a description of the garage door configuration. Mr. Wind stated that there will be a single garage door designed to look like double doors. Mr. Troutman asked if the Board is concerned with the high plate lines of the proposed home. Mr. Knapp stated that the report provided by Sargent Town Planning noted that while the plate lines are higher than those of the adjacent houses, they are appropriate for the Neighborhood Estates area. Mr. Alexander agreed and stated that the plate lines work well with the overall design of the home. Mr. Troutman stated that he is pleased with many of the changes that had been made since the conceptual review and thought the home will be a positive addition to the neighborhood. Ms. Mackle stated that she thought the design is very tasteful and has no issues with the design of the home.

Mr. Troutman asked if there are any visitors that would like to comment on the proposed home.

Mr. Pardo stated that she has no objections to the proposed home. Mr. Shields stated that he thinks the design looks great.

Mr. Merveille thanked the ARB for the opportunity to express his concerns regarding the proposed home. Mr. Merveille stated that he and his wife live directly behind the proposed home and have witnessed the coming and going of many neighbors. He stated that it is exciting to welcome a new neighbor to the neighborhood. Mr. Merveille stated that he does not have an issue with the size of the house but is concerned about the height and the privacy issues that may arise. He added that the recent weather has damaged some of the trees on the property and would just like to suggest that an effort is made to landscape the property in a way that respects the privacy of all of the neighbors. Ms. Druten stated that privacy is a priority for her as well and that she would like to discuss this issue further with the Merveilles.

Mr. Allen stated that he approves of the design of the home.

Mr. Barnes stated that he is the neighbor to the left and that his house is a lot lower than the Druten's property. Mr. Barnes stated that there have been drainage issues on to the south side of his back yard and asked that an effort is made to alleviate this issue. Mr. Hensler stated that he plans to include a swale on the north end of the Druten's property in order to alleviate the water runoff issues.

Mr. Troutman stated that he would like to go through the substantial construction checklist. Mr. Troutman noted that the depth to width ratio is slightly off; however, the overall dimensions of the

home are not out of line. Mr. Troutman stated that there will be an increase in green-space over the existing conditions. Mr. Troutman added that the drainage concerns have been discussed and a water drainage study has been performed. Mr. Troutman asked how wide the driveway will be. Mr. Wind replied the driveway will be constructed of asphalt and will measure 12 feet wide. Mr. Troutman noted that while the plate line is higher than recommended, the STP report supported this design choice and the Board feels that it works with the overall design of the home.

Mr. Shortlidge read the required findings for ARB approval of a building permit

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 1: That the structure to be erected or altered does, or will, meet the customary architectural requirements in appearance and design for a structure of the type proposed, and that the proposed structure is, or will be, in general conformity with the style and design of the surrounding structures. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 2: That the proposed structure will not adversely affect the values of surrounding properties and will not adversely affect the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents of the City. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 3: That the proposed structure conforms to the Design Guidelines adopted by Resolution No. 2012-G, or, if it does not conform to the Design Guidelines, that the applicant has provided sufficient justification for the deviation from the Design Guidelines. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Shortlidge read finding 4: That the proposed structure conforms to the principles of the Comprehensive Plan. The Board agreed 4-0.

Mr. Knapp moved to accept the plan as submitted with the condition that the hardscape elements along with the landscape plan will be reviewed at a future meeting; Ms. Mackle seconded. Passed 4-0.

#7 Randy & Julie Edge
6825 Cherokee Lane

New window at side of existing home

Mr. Ault stated that he will be presenting this project as Mr. Edge is unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Ault explained that the Edges are proposing to add a new window at the side of their home at an existing rear wing. Mr. Ault continued that the proposed window is located in an offset at the side of the house next to an existing chimney. Mr. Ault added that the only concern is the lack of symmetry as there will not be a window on the opposite side of the chimney. Ms. Christensen noted that in previous cases the ARB has required a symmetrical design when adding windows.

Mr. Alexander asked what is in the interior on the side of the chimney with no proposed window. Mr. Ault stated that from the plans, it appears to be a closet. Ms. Mackle asked if the window will be visible from the rear. Mr. Ault stated that the proposed window will not be visible from the rear of the house and that due to the limited visibility of that portion of the house, one window should be ok. Mr. Alexander stated that due to the limited visibility of the proposed window a second, matching window should not be necessary. The Board agreed.

Ms. Mackle moved to approve the plans as submitted; Mr. Alexander seconded. Passed 4-0.

Mr. Troutman moved to adjourn the meeting; Ms. Mackle seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:46.

Mark Baltzell, Intern